



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,591	11/28/2003	Judi Bryant	SCH-1995	5673
23599 7590 03/17/2008 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201				
EXAMINER				
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/722,591

**Applicant(s)**

BRYANT ET AL.

**Examiner**/Venkataraman  
Balasubramanian/**Art Unit**

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 32-34, 36 and 39-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12, 17, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 32-34, 36 and 39-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' response filed on 12/3/2007 is made of record. In view of applicants' amendment to claim 6 to limit R<sup>1</sup> halogen, all prior art rejections made in the previous office action have been deemed as obviated. However, the following rejections are applied to currently pending claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Recitation of "X represents or" in claim 3 and claim 4 renders these claims indefinite as it is not clear what choice is intended for X.
2. Claims 3 and 4 are improper dependent claims as they fail to further limit claim 6 on which they are dependent. Note R<sup>2</sup> definition of these claims include hydrogen, which is not a choice for R<sup>2</sup> of claim 6.
3. Claim 3 is indefinite as it recites divalent radicals C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> and C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>6</sub> for R<sup>2</sup> choices. Note R<sup>2</sup> is not divalent radical.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1624

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brumby et al., US 2004/0102630.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Brumby et al., teaches several CDK inhibitory pyrimidines which include instant compounds, composition and method of use. See formula I and note the definition of various variable groups. Note with the given definition of various variable groups, the compounds taught by Brumby et al., include instant compounds. See entire document. Especially see pages 18-185 for various compounds. See compound 231 (page 74).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brumby et al., US 2004/0102630.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Teaching of Brumby et al., as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Brumby et al., teaches a genus of compounds which include instant compounds for the same use. In addition, some compounds taught by Brumby et al., are positional isomers and or homologs. For example the hydroxyl in the phenyl ring is in 3 or 4 position as compared to 2- position required by instant claim and the ester group is ethyl ester while instant claim require besides ethyl methyl ester as well. Furthermore, Brumby teaches bromo, chloro and fluoro at 5-position while instant claims besides bromo require nitro at 5- position. There is only one variation in some of these compounds.

However, Brumby et al., teaches equivalency of the compounds exemplified with those generically claimed for compound of formula I.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Brumby et

al. and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

In addition, positional isomers and homologs are not deemed patentably distinct absent evidence of superior or unexpected properties. See *In re Crounse*, 150 USPQ 554; *In re Norris* 84 USPQ 458; *In re Finely* 81 USPQ 383 and 387; *Ex parte Engelhardt*, 208 USPQ 343; *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474, regarding positional isomers. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548.

Thus it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to expect instant compounds to possess the utility taught by the applied art in view of the close structural similarity outlined above.

Claims 3-12, 17, 19-20, 26-27, 29, 32-34, 36 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahmann et al. US 2003/0171359.

Dahmann et al. teaches several 2,4,5-trisubstituted pyrimidines as kinase inhibitors useful for treating arthritis, which include instant compounds. See page 2, formula I. note the definition of various variable groups. Especially note the RaNRb definition overlaps with instant aniline group, RcNRd overlaps with instant X-R2 and the Re choices includes instant R<sup>1</sup> halogen choice. Thus, with the given definition of these groups, compounds taught by Dahmann et al., include instant compounds. See entire document for details of the invention. Particularly see pages 23-86 for large number of compounds Especially see example 1, which include several instant compounds. See compounds 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 47, 48, 53, 55, 57, 58, 62, 67, 73, 75, 76, 78, 88 and 92. See also examples 2-13. As seen, there are number of compounds

which differ only in having NO<sub>2</sub> in the 5-position of the pyrimidine instead of a halogen in that position as required by instant R<sup>1</sup>.

But, Dahmann et al., teaches halogen for R<sup>1</sup> choice and thus teaches equivalency of the halogen with nitro in the 5 position of the pyrimidine. Thus, it would be obvious to one trained in the art to vary the substituents in the 5- position with those generically taught and with those explicitly taught.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Dahmann et al. and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

### ***Double Patenting***

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 41 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim17. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).



### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624

